

## REMARKS

The Office Action of December 29, 2008 has been received and carefully reviewed. It is submitted that, by this Amendment, all bases of rejection are traversed and overcome. Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-11 and 13-18 remain in the application. Claim 19 is cancelled herein. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Applicant acknowledges and appreciates the indication that claims 1-8 contain allowable subject matter.

Claims 10, 11, and 13, 14 and 16 have been amended to correct minor grammatical and/or inadvertent errors. Furthermore, claim 19 has been canceled. It is submitted that no new matter has been introduced in light of any of the amendments to the foregoing claims.

Claims 9-11 and 13-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gore (U.S. Patent No. 6,406,138) in view of Kasperchik, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,585,364). The Examiner asserts that Gore discloses all of the elements of independent claims 9 and 16, except for heating the recording medium during underprinting and depositing. The Examiner relies on Kasperchick to supply the deficiency of Gore. The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the inkjet recording method and system of Gore by the teaching in Kasperchik in order to have a high quality printed image.

The Applicant does not acquiesce to the Examiner's rejection stated above. However, in order to expedite prosecution, independent claims 9 and 16 have been amended to further clarify the claims. More specifically, claim 9 has been amended to recite, "**heating** the print zone **during the underprinting and the depositing** so that the print zone is at a temperature between about 45°C and about 85°C during the underprinting and the depositing" (emphasis added). Claim 16 has also been amended to recite, "a pen set configured to apply a dye-based ink and a charged polymer fixer to the plain paper in a print zone **heated during application of the**

***dye-based ink and the charged polymer fixer***” (emphasis added). Support for the new recitations in claims 9 and 16 may be found in Applicant’s specification as filed, at least in paragraph [0032], and in the claims as originally filed.

Gore discloses a method of inkjet printing including underprinting a fixer fluid (i.e., a 5<sup>th</sup> pen fluid) onto a substrate and depositing an ink on the underprinted fixer. Gore further discloses that the substrate may be heated ***after*** printing to a temperature from about 40°C to about 400°C. (See column 5, line 60 through column 6, line 16 of Gore.) To begin with, Applicant submits that Gore does ***not*** teach that the heating occurs *during* the printing of the fixer and the ink (in sharp contrast to Applicant’s claims 9 and 16). Further, since the heating step in Gore occurs ***after*** printing, Applicant also submits that the print zone ***during*** the printing of the fixer and the ink is likely at a temperature ***less than*** 40°C (i.e., a temperature less than the lower limit of the after printing heating temperature in Gore).

Applicant further submits that Kasperchik *fails* to supply the deficiencies of Gore identified above. Kasperchik discloses a method for treating swellable media in inkjet printing to improve print quality. The method includes applying a treatment fluid to the swellable medium no more than one minute before the ink is applied to the medium (see column 1, lines 34-38). In an example, the media may be heated as the treatment fluid is applied (see column 3, lines 9-10).

At the outset, Applicant submits that Kasperchick does ***not*** disclose the temperature of the media during the application of the treatment fluid step and during the printing of the ink step. Thus, Kasperchik does ***not*** disclose that the media is at the Applicant’s temperature range (between about 45°C and about 85°C) during the application and the printing steps.

Kasperchik also discloses that the heating step is accomplished immediately ***before*** the printing of the ink onto the media (see column 3, lines 41-43). To briefly summarize the method of Kasperchik, the media is heated as the treatment fluid is applied to the media, ***and then*** the ink is printed onto the media. Applicant submits

that Kasperchik does **not** disclose that heating is accomplished during **both** i) the application of the treatment fluid, and ii) the printing of the ink.

For all the reasons stated above, Applicant submits that the combination of Gore and Kasperchik fails to disclose all of the elements of independent claims 9 and 16. As such, it is submitted that Applicant's invention as defined in independent claims 9 and 16, and in those claims depending ultimately therefrom, is not anticipated, taught or rendered obvious by Gore and Kasperchik, either alone or in combination, and patentably defines over the art of record.

In summary, claims 1-11 and 13-18 remain in the application, and claim 19 is canceled herein. It is submitted that, through this Amendment, Applicant's invention as set forth in these claims is now in a condition suitable for allowance.

Further and favorable consideration is requested. If the Examiner believes it would expedite prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact Applicant's Attorney at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

DIERKER & ASSOCIATES, P.C.

/Julia Church Dierker/

Julia Church Dierker  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 33368  
(248) 649-9900, ext. 25  
juliad@troypatent.com

3331 West Big Beaver Rd., Suite 109  
Troy, Michigan 48084-2813  
Dated: March 30, 2009  
JCD/AMS/JRK